



**Draft Notes from May 1, 2014 Meeting with MDEQ/USEPA-Region 5/COK
11:00 AM to 3:00 PM EDT @ City Hall, St. Joseph, MI**

Attendees: Paul Bucholtz (MDEQ); Ron Smedley (MDEQ); Tom Bloom (USEPA-Region 5); Michael Berkoff (USEPA-Region 5); Jeff Kaiser (CH2MHill/USEPA-Region 5); Marc Hatton (City of Kalamazoo); Bruce Merchant (Consultant, City of Kalamazoo)

I. Logistics/Meeting Issues

- a. Best if we keep meeting face-to-face. Helpful in getting work completed
- b. Go longer today (per Michael) if needed/desired. May be tough to go all day today but will plan on it for next meeting.

II. May 19, 2014 Meeting with Larger Group

- a. Key “check-in” point. Need to keep in mind the “big picture” issues and not details.
- b. We need to remain flexible as a group
- c. Concerns/Issues –
 - i. Can we come up with options?
 - ii. Can we develop conceptual options to work on as we move forward?

III. Today’s meeting and discussion – critical in moving forward

- a. Key need: work on “pinch points” and other concerns
- b. Work on how/what to report out on to the larger group on May 19 (and beyond)
- c. Documentation is needed
- d. We need to “create a product” as a group
- e. We need to look at the potential solutions and not all the specific problems that may be associated with them – we need to agree on the “big picture” items

IV. Follow up Items from April 23, 2014 meeting in Kalamazoo

- a. From map prepared by City:
 - i. Bus Routes – they currently go by Goodwill on Alcott Street. Stops and routes are modified as needed and as demand requires
 - ii. Trailway not well defined yet as to exact route – it will generally follow Portage Creek
- b. Site Logistics Issues
 - i. Has there been a “mill determination” made for Performance Paper and even the old Monarch Mill sites?
 - ii. Panelyte – an existing State 201 site? Release of liability is needed – best if City owns it and not State (or County) Land Bank
 - iii. These appear to be “steps to work through” and not specific “hurdles”

V. Overall Vision for the Portage Creek Corridor

- a. Place for non-profit organizations (?)
- b. Orientation of Site re: Visioning Process
 - i. East/West - ?
 - ii. North/South - ?
- c. Need for “WOW” factor(s) for and around the Site
- d. Connections –
 - i. Portage Creek Trailway – South to Portage/North to KRVF
 - ii. Neighborhoods – especially east/west connections
- e. Water feature(s)

VI. Options – Presented by USEPA-Region 5/CH2MHill

a. See 3 handouts from Jeff Kaiser – CH2MHill

- i. Handout #1 – Summary of options, estimated footprints (in acres), estimated heights and estimated total costs.
- ii. Handout #2 – “Hill” option
- iii. Handout #3 – “Flat” option

b. Discussion on all 3 handouts. (There was considerable discussion on all three handouts with many questions and concerns raised.) Some key issues raised in these discussions were:

- i. All the options need to be “filtered” through the goals established at the April 23, 2014 meeting:
 - 1. Transformative for the Community – A community “attactor”
 - 2. Maintain a long-term perspective for End Use Redevelopment
 - 3. Site has to be productive – a community asset that provides economic development/tax base
 - 4. Site sustainability – environmentally and economically
 - 5. Public perception indicators/concerns
 - 6. City of Kalamazoo/USEPA-Region 5/MDEQ will continue to maintain a partnership approach to the Site

VII. Constraints/Issues (“Hurdles”)

a. Financial/Costs –

There was considerable discussion regarding this particular constraint. Michael shared USEPA-Region 5 concerns regarding where City (and others) may “anticipate/expect” any extra money to come from based on the option(s) selected.

b. Legal

Issues associated with long-term ownership of the Site were discussed. These issues related to not just the Allied Superfund Site but the Panelyte site as well. Concerns related to potential involvement of the County Land Bank were also discussed.

c. Engineering/Technical

There was limited discussion related to the steepness of the available slope on top of an engineered cover for any remaining active landfill areas. Off-gassing from the landfill as well as other logistically concerns were also discussed.

d. Redevelopment

Considerable discussion/education on redevelopment possibilities and constraints were discussed with Marc Hatton, Ron Smedley, and Tom Bloom providing input on what does (or does not) work well when redeveloping these type of sites.

e. Political/Communication

Some of the ongoing political/community issues were also discussed especially in light of how best to eventually present a “hybrid” solution to the public.

VIII. Options Discussion

- a.** “Hill” option – See Handout #2. Provides for approximately 50% less “footprint” along with open access (cost estimates include off-site removal of Monarch HRDL) – This appears to be a viable option to pursue given potential variations available during construction/implementation of this option.

- b. “Flat” option – See Handout #3. Provides for approximately 20% less “footprint” along with open access (cost estimates include off-site removal of Monarch HRDL) – There was discussion regarding whether this option accomplished enough of the agreed upon goals from the City’s perspective especially relate to available redevelopment areas.
- c. Other Options – some other general options were discussed especially related to east/west connections as well as north/south connections. No specific drawings/concepts were explored at this meeting; however, it was suggested that the sub-group continue to look at other potential options prior to the next meeting.

IX. Next Steps/Meeting

- a. **Strategies of May 19, 2014 Larger Group Meeting**
 - i. Are there options? (Sub-group has said “yes”)
 - ii. Are their obstacles/hurdles? (Sub-group has said “yes”)
 - iii. Is there room to move forward? (Sub-group has said “yes”)
 - iv. There was considerable discussion on what the sub-group has control over and what it doesn’t have control over.
 - v. There was agreement that the sub-group needs to ask the larger group how best to proceed and if options are reasonable and resources should be spent to explore them further.
 - vi. Need to provide specifics regarding the list of obstacles or hurdles and refine request of larger group on how best to begin addressing these concerns. There was discussion regarding the need to not over-emphasize specific hurdles but to simply state what they are.
 - vii. Need to discuss and decide what specifically the May 19, 2014 meeting is about and how best to proceed.
 - viii. Discussed some type of formal presentation for May 19 meeting that would include background/facts that sub-group has been dealing with so far.
- b. **Next Meeting – Monday, May 12, 2014 9:00AM-3:30PM EDT at St. Joseph, MI City Hall.**